arXiv:1501.01602v1 [math-ph] 7 Jan 2015

A Proposed Definition of Functional Integrals

J. LaChapelle

Abstract

Functional integrals are defined in terms of families of locally compact topological groups and their associated Banach-valued Haar integrals. The definition abandons the hope of defining a genuine measure on the integral domain, and instead gives a topological realization of localization in the integral domain leading to measurable subspaces that characterize meaningful functional integrals. The proposed definition is natural in the sense that it includes other successful approaches to functional integrals within a broader framework. In turn, the framework suggests new and potentially useful functional integrals.

1 Introduction

One of the most discordant objects in mathematical physics is the functional integral. On one hand, heuristic techniques employing functional integrals have had remarkable success both in physics and mathematics. The successes in physics are myriad and well-known; but for the most part they simply reproduce results that can be obtained through operator methods — albeit usually more directly and intuitively.[1] On the mathematics side, particularly algebraic topology, functional integrals have both reproduced old results and inspired new ones (see e.g. [1]–[6] to name just a few). And yet there is still no widely accepted mathematically rigorous definition encompassing all types of functional integrals.

There are, of course, already some rigorous constructions of functional integrals that have been developed [7]–[17].[2] But it is fair to say they are not generally viewed as definitive; perhaps because they are restricted to subclasses of functions that have limited applicability [7], [9], [11], [13], [15], [16] or perhaps because they abandon the notion of integration with respect to an orthodox measure [8], [10], [12], [17]. An excellent up-to-date synopsis of various approaches and a good source of authoritative references is [18].

It would be satisfying to have a definition of functional integrals in general (which includes Feynman path integrals in particular) that promises the possibility of mathematical rigor and broad applicability while maintaining the pragmatic heuristics that is their hallmark. Needless to say, such a definition would have to be consistent with existing heuristic and rigorous constructions.

If one is searching for such a definition, taking stock of shared characteristics among the various rigorous approaches is a good place to start. We can immediately make two rather obvious observations about the various approaches to functional integration: i) functional inte-

[1] Indeed, insofar as functional integral methods gain legitimacy via corroborating operator methods, one can view functional integrals as an efficient shortcut device for implementing the symmetry, locality, and unitarity requirements of a quantum theory.

[2] The cited references are meant to be representative: They are definitely not exhaustive. Apologies to all excluded authors.

grals are typically defined in terms of a limiting sequence of finite dimensional objects and/or by some Fourier-type duality; and ii) evaluating integrals invariably involves some kind of reduction/localization in the integration domain that eventually leads to finite-dimensional, or at least measurable, integral domains. Indeed, in retrospect it seems impossible to devise a consistent scheme any other way.

In essence, the observations are telling us that there is no single functional integral associated with a function space; rather, there is a whole family of integrals corresponding to different 'questions'[3] one may ask — much like the case of general versus particular solutions in the theory of differential equations. The entire family represents a tool to probe the function space, and measure-theoretic issues come into play only *after* a specific 'question' has been posed. This idea is not new. It is always implicit in any functional integral evaluation, and it is often even explicitly stated in the form of localization principles (see e.g. [19]). Our aim here is to identify the mathematics that capture this essence.

Keeping the observations in mind, we propose to define functional integrals in terms of data $(G, \mathfrak{B}, G_\Lambda)$ where G is a topological group, $\mathfrak{B}$ is a Banach space, and $G_\Lambda := \{G_\lambda, \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ is a family of locally compact topological groups indexed by continuous homomorphisms $\lambda : G \to G_\lambda$. With this data we define integral operators int_λ on a suitable space of integrable functionals $\mathbf{F}(G) \ni \mathrm{F} : G \to \mathfrak{B}$ by

$$\mathrm{int}_\lambda(\mathrm{F}) = \int_G \mathrm{F}(g)\mathcal{D}_\lambda g := \int_{G_\lambda} f(g_\lambda)\, d\nu(g_\lambda) \tag{1}$$

with $\mathrm{F} = f \circ \lambda$ and $f \in L^1(G_\lambda, \mathfrak{B})$ for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$. We call int_Λ a family of integral operators on $\mathbf{F}(G)$ and $\mathcal{D}_\Lambda g$ its associated family of integrators.

The right-hand side of (1) is clearly well-defined once a choice of Haar measure $\nu(G_\lambda)$ is made. So the definition will be meaningful if the set of continuous homomorphisms Λ can be quantified. In the sequel we will give some examples of well-known embodiments of Λ, and we will see that int_Λ is really nothing more than a shorthand notation for the two observations discussed above.

Nevertheless, the shorthand int_Λ has value. First, it serves as a vehicle to transfer algebraic structure between $\mathfrak{B}$ and locally compact neighborhoods in $\mathbf{F}(G)$. Second, it simultaneously incorporates both measure-theoretic and Fourier-duality approaches. And third, it begs for the introduction of non-Gaussian integrators that have useful potential.

The plan of this paper is to give evidence to these three attributes of int_Λ. We first state the proposed definition of functional integral and investigate its algebraic properties when they exist. (In a subsequent paper, this will allow us to construct functional integral representations of quantum operators.) Next, some examples of well-known successful approaches to functional integrals are shown to be included in the framework. These approaches are based on the prototypic Gaussian integrator family so it is appropriate that we spend some time developing these integrators in detail. We consider integrators induced by symmetric *and* skew-symmetric complex quadratic forms. It is significant that the latter are characterized by Pfaffians; thus enabling the construction of Grassmann-like functional integrals and, more generally, functional integrals over the underlying group of a $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded module. Finally, we briefly develop a non-quadratic integrator family closely allied with

[3]By 'question' we mean some kind of restriction or constraint pertinent to one's problem that singles out a subclass of functions in the integration domain.

gamma statistics and then use it to define what can be viewed as 'distributionals' on a certain dual topological group. For certain parameters, the gamma-type integrator family can be interpreted as Poisson-type, and we use it to give a functional integral representation of the evolution operator in quantum mechanics.

Assuming one accepts the proposed definition, the functional integral game starts with specifying $(G, \mathfrak{B}, G_\Lambda)$. The physical or mathematical model of interest determines G and $\mathfrak{B}$. But the difficult work of quantifying Λ remains. This task is application specific and can be quite involved. Consequently we only indicate certain pertinent aspects as they occur in the examples.

2 The definition

Start with the data $(G, \mathfrak{B}, G_\Lambda)$ where G is a Hausdorff topological group, $\mathfrak{B}$ is a Banach space that may have additional algebraic structure, and $G_\Lambda := \{G_\lambda, \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ is a family of locally compact topological groups indexed by continuous homomorphisms $\lambda : G \to G_\lambda$.

The idea is to use the rigorous $\mathfrak{B}$-valued integration theory associated with $\{G_\lambda, \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ to define and characterize functional integration on G.[4]

Definition 2.1 *Let ν be a left Haar measure[5] on G_λ, and $L^1(G_\lambda, \mathfrak{B})$ be the Banach space of $\mathfrak{B}$-valued functions $f : G_\lambda \to \mathfrak{B}$ integrable with respect to ν. Let $\mathbf{F}(G)$ denote the space of integrable functionals* $\mathrm{F} : G \to \mathfrak{B}$.

A family (indexed by Λ) of integral operators $\mathrm{int}_\Lambda : \mathbf{F}(G) \to \mathfrak{B}$ *is defined by*

$$\mathrm{int}_\lambda(\mathrm{F}) = \int_G \mathrm{F}(g)\mathcal{D}_\lambda g := \int_{G_\lambda} f(g_\lambda)\, d\nu(g_\lambda) \tag{2}$$

where $\mathrm{F} = f \circ \lambda$ *with* $f \in L^1(G_\lambda, \mathfrak{B})$ *for all* $\lambda \in \Lambda$.[6] *We say that* F *is integrable with respect to the integrator family $\mathcal{D}_\Lambda g$.*

Further, if $\mathfrak{B}$ is an algebra, define the functional $*$-convolution and $\star$-convolution by

$$(\mathrm{F}_1 * \mathrm{F}_2)_\lambda(g) := \int_G \mathrm{F}_1(\tilde{g})\mathrm{F}_2(\tilde{g}^{-1}g)\mathcal{D}_\lambda\tilde{g} \tag{3}$$

and

$$(\mathrm{F}_1 \star \mathrm{F}_2)_\lambda(g) := \int_G \mathrm{F}_1(\tilde{g}g)\mathrm{F}_2(\tilde{g}\tilde{g})\mathcal{D}_\lambda\tilde{g} \tag{4}$$

for each $\lambda \in \Lambda$.

For any given λ, the integral operator is linear and bounded according to

$$\|\mathrm{int}_\lambda(\mathrm{F})\| \le \int_{G_\lambda} \|f(g_\lambda)\|\, d\nu(g_\lambda) = \|f\|_1 < \infty\,. \tag{5}$$

[4] It is probably fruitful to consider G_Λ as a locally compact topological groupoid, but this would add a layer of complexity that is better left as a separate investigation.

[5] The Haar measure ν does not necessarily have unit normalization. Also, recall that if ν and μ are left and right Haar measures respectively, then $\nu(G_\lambda) = \mu(G_\lambda^{-1})$ and $d\nu(g_\lambda) = \Delta(g_\lambda^{-1})d\mu(g_\lambda^{-1})$ where Δ is the modular function on G_λ.

[6] Insofar as G_λ may be an abelian group of suitably defined maps, this justifies calling $\mathbf{F}(G)$ the space of integrable functionals, and it is convenient to keep this terminology in the general case.

This suggests to define the norm $\|\mathrm{F}\| := \sup_\lambda \|\mathrm{F}\|_\lambda$ where

$$\|\mathrm{F}\|_\lambda := \int_G \|\mathrm{F}(g)\| \, \mathcal{D}_\lambda g \; := \int_{G_\lambda} \|f(g_\lambda)\| \, d\nu(g_\lambda) = \|f\|_1 < \infty \, . \tag{6}$$

The definition of $*$-convolution then implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathrm{F}_1 * \mathrm{F}_2\|_\lambda &= \int_{G_\lambda} \int_{G_\lambda} \|f_1(\tilde{g}_\lambda) f_2(\tilde{g}_\lambda^{-1} g_\lambda)\| \, d\nu(\tilde{g}_\lambda, g_\lambda) \\ &= \int_{G_\lambda} \int_{G_\lambda} \|f_1(\tilde{g}_\lambda) f_2(g_\lambda)\| \, d\nu(\tilde{g}_\lambda) d\nu(g_\lambda) \\ &\leq \int_{G_\lambda} \int_{G_\lambda} \|f_1(\tilde{g}_\lambda)\| \|f_2(g_\lambda)\| \, d\nu(\tilde{g}_\lambda) d\nu(g_\lambda) \\ &= \|\mathrm{F}_1\|_\lambda \|\mathrm{F}_2\|_\lambda \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where the second line follows from left-invariance of the Haar measure and the last line follows from Fubini. Moreover, a similar computation (using left-invariance and Fubini) establishes $(\mathrm{F}_1 * \mathrm{F}_2) * \mathrm{F}_3 = \mathrm{F}_1 * (\mathrm{F}_2 * \mathrm{F}_3)$. Consequently, $\mathbf{F}(G)$ inherits the algebraic structure of $\mathfrak{B}$:

Proposition 2.1 $\mathbf{F}(G)$ *equipped with the* $*$*-convolution is a Banach algebra when completed w.r.t. the norm* $\|\mathrm{F}\| := \sup_\lambda \|\mathrm{F}\|_\lambda$.

Similarly,

Proposition 2.2 *If* $\mathfrak{B} \equiv \mathfrak{B}^*$ *is a Banach* $*$*-algebra, then* $\mathbf{F}(G)$ *— endowed with a suitable topology and involution* $\mathrm{F}^*(g) := \mathrm{F}(g^{-1})^* \Delta(g^{-1})$ *and completed with respect to the norm* $\|\mathrm{F}\| = \sup_\lambda \|\mathrm{F}\|_\lambda$ *— is a Banach* $*$*-algebra, and* int_λ *is a* $*$*-homomorphism.*

Proof: The $*$-operation is continuous for a suitable choice of topology, and linearity is obvious. Next,

$$(\mathrm{F}^*)^*(g) := \mathrm{F}^*(g^{-1})^* \Delta(g^{-1}) = (\mathrm{F}(g)^*)^* \Delta(g) \Delta(g^{-1}) = \mathrm{F}(g) \tag{8}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\mathrm{F}_1^* * \mathrm{F}_2^*\right)_\lambda (g) &:= \int_{G_\lambda} f_1^*(\tilde{g}_\lambda) f_2^*(\tilde{g}_\lambda^{-1} g_\lambda) \, d\nu(\tilde{g}_\lambda) \\ &= \int_{G_\lambda} \left(f_2(g_\lambda^{-1} \tilde{g}_\lambda) \Delta(g_\lambda^{-1} \tilde{g}_\lambda) f_1(\tilde{g}_\lambda^{-1}) \Delta(\tilde{g}_\lambda^{-1}) \right)^* \, d\nu(\tilde{g}_\lambda) \\ &= \left(\int_{G_\lambda} f_2(g_\lambda^{-1} \tilde{g}_\lambda) f_1(\tilde{g}_\lambda^{-1}) \Delta(g_\lambda^{-1}) \, d\nu(\tilde{g}_\lambda) \right)^* \\ &= \left((\mathrm{F}_2 * \mathrm{F}_1)_\lambda (g^{-1}) \right)^* \Delta(g^{-1}) \\ &= (\mathrm{F}_2 * \mathrm{F}_1)_\lambda^* (g) \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where we used the definition of involution, left-invariance of the Haar measure, and the fact that the modular function Δ is a homomorphism.

For the norm, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathrm{F}^*\|_\lambda &:= \int_G \|\mathrm{F}^*(g)\|\ \mathcal{D}_\lambda g \\
&= \int_G \|\mathrm{F}(g^{-1})^*\Delta(g^{-1})\|\ \mathcal{D}_\lambda g \\
&= \int_G \|\mathrm{F}(g^{-1})^*\|\Delta(g^{-1})\ \mathcal{D}_\lambda g \\
&= \int_G \|\mathrm{F}(g)^*\|\ \mathcal{D}_\lambda g \\
&= \|\mathrm{F}\|_\lambda
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where the fourth line follows by virtue of the Haar measure. And for the integral operators,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{int}_\lambda(\mathrm{F}^*) = \int_G \mathrm{F}^*(g)\mathcal{D}_\lambda g &:= \int_{G_\lambda} f^*(g_\lambda)\ d\nu(g_\lambda) \\
&= \int_{G_\lambda} f(g_\lambda^{-1})^*\Delta(g_\lambda^{-1})\ d\nu(g_\lambda) \\
&= \int_{G_\lambda} f(g_\lambda)^*\ d\nu(g_\lambda) \\
&= \left(\int_{G_\lambda} f(g_\lambda)\ d\nu(g_\lambda)\right)^* \\
&= \mathrm{int}_\lambda(\mathrm{F})^*
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{int}_\lambda\left(\mathrm{F}_1 * \mathrm{F}_2\right)_\lambda &:= \int_{G_\lambda}\int_{G_\lambda} f_1(\tilde{g}_\lambda) f_2(\tilde{g}_\lambda^{-1} g_\lambda)\ d\nu(\tilde{g}_\lambda, g_\lambda) \\
&= \int_{G_\lambda}\int_{G_\lambda} f_1(\tilde{g}_\lambda) f_2(g_\lambda)\ d\nu(\tilde{g}_\lambda) d\nu(g_\lambda) \\
&= \mathrm{int}_\lambda\left(\mathrm{F}_1\right)\mathrm{int}_\lambda\left(\mathrm{F}_2\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where we used left-invariance of the Haar measure and Fubini. □

Corollary 2.1 *If $\mathfrak{B}$ is a C^*-algebra, then $\mathbf{F}(G)$ is C^*-algebra when completed w.r.t. the norm $\|\mathrm{F}\| = \sup_\lambda \|\mathrm{F}\|_\lambda$.*

An immediate observation: although the products in $\mathbf{F}(G)$ and $L^1(G_\lambda, \mathfrak{B})$ are trivially equivalent by definition, their respective norms are not. Our choice of norm on $\mathbf{F}(G)$ (along with the fact that the product and involution are only defined within each $L^1(G_\lambda, \mathfrak{B})$) renders it a direct sum $\mathbf{F}(G) = \bigoplus_{\lambda\in\Lambda} L^1(G_\lambda, \mathfrak{B})$. In this regard, a 'question' — which corresponds to a particular λ — induces a projection.

Remark 2.1 In the context of QM, this observation provides a Heisenberg-picture interpretation of the measurement process. Suppose that $\mathbf{F}(G)$ is a non-locally compact C^*-algebra

associated with some quantum quantum system, G governs its dynamics, and $\mathrm{F} \in \mathbf{F}(G)$ is an observable. Further, insist now that $\lambda : G \to G_\lambda$ be an isomorphism. We have seen that the functional F corresponds to an entire family of functions. It is easy to imagine that the physical quantum state of the macroscopic device (which of course cannot be known exactly) that actualizes the observable is modeled by this family of functions and, hence, indexed by the set Λ.

So we have a topological interpretation: performing a measurement and thereby actualizing an observable corresponds to a particular projection of $\mathbf{F}(G)$ onto a locally compact copy $L^1(G_\lambda, \mathfrak{B})$.[7] Precisely which projection is effected cannot be known. Any subsequent measurement will of course be referred to $L^1(G_\lambda, \mathfrak{B}) \subset \mathbf{F}(G)$ unless interaction dynamics takes the system out of this subspace. Evidently, dynamics of a *closed* quantum system would be modeled by $L^1(G_\lambda, \mathfrak{B})$ where λ encodes its initial state.

In effect, the mathematical model supplies a family of isomorphic Hilbert spaces. The family represents a lack of knowledge; not of the system but of the measuring "ruler". Once a measurement has been made, it is given comparative meaning (that is, it can be compared to other measurements) through a specific representation of the associated observable carried by the Hilbert space based on G_λ. Barring *external* interaction, this representation will continue to be descriptive; otherwise the representation will no longer be valid in subsequent measurements. Alternatively, since we have stipulated here that $\lambda : G \to G_\lambda$ is an isomotry, we can imagine a single Hilbert space with an undetermined basis. A measurement allows identification of a relevant basis by which subsequent comparisons of measurement can be made — if no external interactions interfere. If there are external interactions, the chosen basis is no longer relevant and we must start over.

Before leaving this section it is appropriate to stress that int_Λ is a Banach algebra homomorphism. In consequence, it is not hard to see potential applications in quantum physics.

3 Subsumed approaches

The proposed definition of functional integrals is only useful to the extent that it includes known successful approaches. So it is important to spend some time to check that this is the case.

Example 3.1 The Wiener path integral and Feynman path integral via time slicing:

Consider $\mathcal{P}_0\mathbb{C}^m$, the infinite dimensional vector space of piece-wise continuous pointed paths $x : [\mathrm{t}_a, \mathrm{t}_b] \subset \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{C}^m$ with $x(\mathrm{t}_a) = 0$, and take G to be its underlying abelian group equipped with a suitable topology. Choose $\mathfrak{B} \equiv \mathbb{C}$, and let $\Lambda = \{\lambda_n : G \to \mathcal{H}^n_\lambda \ \forall \ n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ by $x \mapsto (x(\mathrm{t}_1), x(\mathrm{t}_2), \ldots, x(\mathrm{t}_n))\}$ where the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^n_\lambda$ comprises states characterized by a mean and covariance.[8]

[7] We do not mean to imply that this projection has any causal effect on physical reality: We are in the Heisenberg picture so the system's initial wave function remains ontological/objective while the observable representing a measurement is epistemic/subjective. We do mean to imply that a *non-locally compact* C^*-algebra describes a pre-measured quantum system, and measurement (which corresponds to a particular isomorphic λ) is only given meaning in the context of a *locally compact* C^*-algebra.

[8] Technically, λ_n maps G to the abelian group underlying $\mathcal{H}^n_\lambda$, but this distinction in not necessary here and it is better to use familiar notation.

Evidently $(\mathcal{H}^n_\lambda, P_{nn'})$ *is a projective system for* G *with* $P_{nn'}$ *given by* $P_{nn'} \circ \lambda_{n'} = \lambda_n$*. It achieves the reduction* $\mathbf{F}(G) = \bigoplus_{\lambda_n} L^1(\mathcal{H}^n_\lambda, \mathbb{C})$*. The projective system can be used to define a promeasure with Gaussian weight (the Wiener measure) under the restrictions* $\mathfrak{B} \equiv \mathbb{R}$ *and* $x : [\mathrm{t}_a, \mathrm{t}_b] \to \mathbb{R}^m$*.*

But in the generic case, $x \in \mathrm{Hom}_C(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{C}^m)$ *with* $\mathbb{T} := [\mathrm{t}_a, \mathrm{t}_b]$ *and* $x(\mathrm{t}_a) = 0$*, and one must either: i) analytically continue the restricted case; ii) use the projective system to define a projective sequence of time-sliced integrals defined using the Trotter product formula; or iii) use the topological dual space, its associated projective system, and Fourier duality to define projective distributions according to* [8], [11]*. Of course one must still determine the class of integrable functions* $f \in L^1(\mathcal{H}^n_\lambda, \mathbb{C})$ *allowed by each approach through functional analysis.*

Remark that one can contemplate more general projective systems that are not based on time slicing. This was rigorously achieved in [12] *in the case where* $\mathcal{P}_0\mathbb{C}^m$ *carries the structure of an infinite-dimensional real, separable Hilbert space. The projections are ordered according to their finite dimension. Coupled with the theory of oscillatory integrals, the projective system for* G *gives rigorous access to Feynman-type path integrals and their localization by stationary phase. Once again, the most difficult work is quantifying integrable functions.*

Unfortunately, projective systems derived from time slicing run into issues if non-cartesian coordinates are used on $\mathbb{C}^m$ (see e.g. [16], Ch. 8). Complications arise because there are consistency conditions that must be obeyed by the projective system, and it may be difficult to find a suitable projective system and/or integrable functions. Even more troublesome; in the case the target manifold is more general than $\mathbb{C}^m$, the space of pointed paths in no longer a Banach space and the projective method cannot be applied directly. In either case, one must be careful to pay close attention to delicate mathematical issues — compromising the intuitive and formal appeal of path integrals.

For Feynman path integrals at least, the shortcomings of the projective method can be sidestepped by utilizing dual topological abelian groups in the framework of Fourier transform as exemplified in [10], [17]. In this framework, one no longer attempts to define a rigorous measure on the integration domain. Instead the path integral is related through duality to a bona fide integral. The next example is a brief outline of the Cartier/DeWitt-Morette (CDM) approach which illistrates this idea.

Example 3.2 Cartier/DeWitt-Morette functional integration scheme [17]:

The CDM scheme for functional integration corresponds to the particular case of $\mathfrak{B} \cong \mathbb{C}$ *and (as above)* G *an abelian topological group underlying an infinite dimensional Banach space. More precisely,* G *is the abelian (additive under point-wise addition) group of continuous pointed maps* $x : (\mathbb{T}, \mathrm{t}_a) \to (\mathbb{C}^m, 0)$ *equipped with a suitable topology, and* $X_0 := \mathcal{P}_0\mathbb{C}^m$ *is its associated Banach space over* $\mathbb{C}$*.*[9] *To be consistent with the notation of CDM, we will abuse notation and write* $G \equiv X_0$ *keeping in mind that scalar multiplication is strictly not allowed. Consequently, any question regarding scale must ultimately be referred to scalar multiplication in* $\mathbf{F}(X_0)$ *through the definition of* int_Λ*.*

[9] CDM uses X_0 as their domain of integration. But the field structure is not relevant to the integration in the sense that their integrators are not invariant under scalar multiplication. Of course *scale* is an important issue, but it is better handled within the algebraic structure of $\mathbf{F}(X_0)$. We accomplish this by including a scale factor $\mathrm{s} \in \mathbb{C}_+$ in the definition of $\mathcal{D}_\lambda x$ (where $\mathbb{C}_+$ is the right-hand complex plane). Otherwise said; the scale s is part of the specification of Λ.

Since X_0 is abelian, the space of one-parameter subgroups $\mathfrak{L}(X_0)$ is a topological vector space. The abelian group X_0' underlying the topological dual $(\mathcal{P}_0\mathbb{C}^m)'$ is assumed to be locally compact when equipped with a suitable topology. Hence, $\mathfrak{L}(X_0)'$ is a Banach space and $L^1(X_0', \mathbb{C})$ is a Banach algebra under convolution.

The space of integrable functionals $\mathbf{F}(X_0)$ is the set of functionals defined by[10]

$$\mathrm{F}_\mu(x) := \int_{X_0'} \Theta(x, x')\, d\mu(x') \tag{13}$$

where $\Theta(x, x') : X_0 \times X_0' \to \mathbb{C}$ is continuous, bounded and integrable with respect to x'. Then $\mathbf{F}(X_0)$ is a Banach space with an induced norm defined as the total variation of μ. Bounded linear integral operators $\int_X \mathcal{D}_\lambda x$ with $\| \int_X \mathrm{F}_\mu \mathcal{D}_\lambda x\| \leq \|\mathrm{F}_\mu\|$ on $\mathbf{F}(X_0)$ are defined by

$$\int_{X_0} \mathrm{F}_\mu(x)\mathcal{D}_\lambda x := \int_{X_0'} \widehat{\mathrm{F}}_\lambda(x')\, d\mu(x') \tag{14}$$

where

$$\int_{X_0} \Theta(x, x')\mathcal{D}_\lambda x := \widehat{\mathrm{F}}_\lambda(x') \tag{15}$$

defines the integrator family $\mathcal{D}_\Lambda x$.

Note that an affine transformation $x \mapsto x + x_a$ along with the translation invariance $\mathcal{D}_\lambda(x + x_a) = \mathcal{D}_\lambda x$ yields integration on X_a, the space of pointed maps $x : (\mathbb{T}, \mathrm{t}_a) \to (\mathbb{C}^m, \mathrm{x}_a)$.

It is evident that a choice of λ corresponds to a chosen class of integrable functions $\widehat{\mathrm{F}}_\lambda(x')$ with respect to $\mu(X_0')$. For the archetypical Gaussian case, λ characterizes the mean and covariance of the Gaussian paths of interest. The functional integral on the left-hand side of (14) *is exact (in the sense it is also specified by the same λ), because there is a one-to-one correspondence between the two sides for Gaussian paths by duality. That is, the Fourier transform of a Gaussian is a Gaussian.*

To handle spaces (which are not topological groups) of pointed maps $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{m}_a}\mathbb{M}$ where now $m : [\mathrm{t}_a, \mathrm{t}_b] \to \mathbb{U} \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ with $m(\mathrm{t}_a) = \mathrm{m}_a$ and $\mathbb{U} \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ an open neighborhood of a smooth $\dim(\mathbb{M}) = m$ Riemannian manifold, CDM uses the left-invariant vector field Lie algebra $\mathfrak{G}_a$ at m_a to identify the non-abelian linear Lie group $\widetilde{G}$ underlying $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{m}_a}\mathbb{M}$. In this case, the Lie algebra morphism $p : \mathfrak{L}(X_0) \to \mathfrak{L}(\widetilde{G})$ induces a morphism $\mathrm{Exp} : \mathfrak{L}(X_0) \to \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{m}_a}\mathbb{M}$ by $\mathrm{Exp}(\mathfrak{x}) = \left(\exp_{\widetilde{G}} \circ\, p\right)(\mathfrak{x})$. Given Exp and the fact that $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{m}_a}\mathbb{M}$ is contractible since it is a pointed space, the parametrization $P : X_0 \to \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{m}_a}\mathbb{M}$ by $x \mapsto \mathrm{Exp}(\log_{X_0}(x))$ allows the integral on $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{m}_a}\mathbb{M}$ to be defined by

$$\int_{\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{m}_a}\mathbb{M}} \mathrm{F}(m)\mathcal{D}_\lambda m := \int_{X_0} \mathrm{F}_\mu(P(x))\mathcal{D}_\lambda(P(x)) := \int_{X_0} \mathrm{F}_\mu(P(x))\, |\mathrm{Det}_\lambda P'_{(x)}|\, \mathcal{D}_\lambda x\ . \tag{16}$$

The left-hand side furnishes the path integral route to quantum mechanics. Note that it has limited applicability if $\mathbb{M}$ is not geodesically complete.

On the other hand, if $\mathbb{M} = \mathbb{G}$ happens to be a Lie group manifold, then (16) *can be readily used since the Lie algebra is already available;*

$$\int_{\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{g}_a}\mathbb{G}} \mathrm{F}(m)\mathcal{D}_\lambda m := \int_{X_0} \mathrm{F}_\mu(P(x))\mathcal{D}_\lambda(P(x)) = \int_{\mathbb{G}} f_\lambda(g)\, d\nu(g)\ . \tag{17}$$

[10] Since Haar measures can only differ by a scalar multiple, the μ designation of F_μ can be dropped if we agree to use *the* normalized Haar measure.

In particular, this means that the free point-to-point propagator on a group manifold is 'exact' in the sense that it can be expressed as a sum over relevant λ of finite dimensional integrals. Again, the left-hand side is exact due to Pontryagin duality.

Alternatively, CDM uses the soldering form $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ on the frame bundle $F(\mathbb{M})$ equipped with a connection to construct a parametrization $\mathrm{Dev} : \dot{\mathcal{P}}_{\mathrm{m}_a}\mathbb{M} \to \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{m}_a}\mathbb{M}$ *where $\dot{\mathcal{P}}_{\mathrm{m}_a}\mathbb{M}$ is the abelian topological group of pointed maps $\dot{m} : [\mathrm{t}_a, \mathrm{t}_b] \to \mathbb{U} \subseteq T_{\mathrm{m}_a}(\mathbb{M})$ with $\dot{m}(\mathrm{t}_a) = 0$. The explicit construction of the development map uses the identification $\boldsymbol{\theta}(\mathrm{hor}(v_p)) = \dot{z}$ where $\dot{z} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ and $\mathrm{hor}(v_p) \in T_p(F(\mathbb{M}))$ is tangent to the horizontal lift $\widetilde{m}(\mathrm{T})$ of $m(\mathrm{T})$. Then* $\mathrm{Dev}(\dot{m}) = (\pi \circ \widetilde{m})$ *where π is the projection on the frame bundle and*

$$\int_{\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{m}_a}\mathbb{M}} \mathrm{F}(m)\mathcal{D}_\lambda m := \int_{\dot{\mathcal{P}}_{\mathrm{m}_a}\mathbb{M}} \mathrm{F}_\mu(\mathrm{Dev}(\dot{m}))\mathcal{D}_\lambda(\mathrm{Dev}(\dot{m})) \; . \tag{18}$$

When $\mathbb{M} = \mathbb{G}$ and the connection is Riemannian, Dev *and* Exp *amount to the same thing.*

It should be noted that [17] already suggested generalizing the space of pointed paths in their scheme to include locally compact *abelian* groups. And we stress that localization/projective system in the CDM framework is effected indirectly through Pontryagin duality.

Example 3.3 Loop groups:

The previous two examples can readily be applied to the class of continuous maps $x : \mathbb{S}^1 \to \mathbb{G}$ yielding functional integrals whose domains are the free loop group $L\mathbb{G} = \mathrm{Hom}_C(\mathbb{S}^1, \mathbb{G})$ or the based loop group $\Omega\mathbb{G} = \mathrm{Hom}_C((\mathbb{S}^1, s_o), (\mathbb{G}, g_o))$ of some Lie group $\mathbb{G}$. Utilizing a suitable parametrization à la the CDM scheme, these can be extended to loop spaces $L\mathbb{M}$ and $\Omega\mathbb{M}$ of a Riemannian manifold. We are, of course, glossing over symmetry issues regarding invariance of the initial point for paths in $L\mathbb{M}$.

The next obvious generalization is to promote paths to fields with suitable analytic properties; $x : \mathbb{D} \to \mathbb{M}$ where $\mathbb{D}$ is a smooth Riemannian manifold with $\dim(\mathbb{D}) = d \leq m$.

Example 3.4 CDM for fields [20]:

Let $\mathcal{F}\mathbb{C}^m$ be the Sobolev space $W^{k,p}(\mathbb{U})$ of L^p maps $x : \mathbb{U} \subseteq \mathbb{D} \to \mathbb{C}^m$ with $\mathbb{U}$ open and $\mathbb{D}$ a compact (with or without boundary) or open Riemannian manifold. If $\mathbb{D}$ has boundary $\partial\mathbb{D}$, let $\mathcal{F}_0\mathbb{C}^m = W_0^{k,p}(\mathbb{U})$, the closure of the vector space of C^∞ maps with compact support in $\mathbb{U}$. Recall that $W^{k,p}(\mathbb{U})$ and $W_0^{k,p}(\mathbb{U})$ are Banach. Continue to take $\mathfrak{B} \equiv \mathbb{C}$, and again abuse notation by writing $\mathcal{F}\mathbb{C}^m \equiv X$ or $\mathcal{F}_0\mathbb{C}^m \equiv X$. Of course, particular applications require consideration of some type of boundary conditions or functional constraints implemented through Λ.

Let $\mathcal{F}\mathbb{M}$ denote the space of fields $x : \mathbb{D} \to \mathbb{M}$ for both open and compact $\mathbb{D}$ for notational simplicity. Introduce the exterior differential system

$$\{\boldsymbol{\omega}_I = 0\} \, , \tag{19}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\omega}_I \in \Lambda T^*\mathcal{F}\mathbb{M}$ with $I \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$ and $N \leq m$. This system defines a parametrization $P : X \to \mathcal{F}\mathbb{M}$ by

$$P^*\boldsymbol{\omega}_I = 0 \;\; \forall \, I \; . \tag{20}$$

As with the previous case of paths, two particularly prevalent parametrizations arise from Pfaff exterior differential systems associated with the exponential map $\mathrm{Exp} : T_x(\mathcal{F}\mathbb{M}) \to \mathcal{F}\mathbb{M}$ *and the development map* $\mathrm{Dev} : \mathcal{F}T_{\mathrm{m}_a}(\mathbb{M}) \to \mathcal{F}\mathbb{M}$.

Finally, define

$$\int_{\mathcal{FM}} \mathrm{F}(m)\mathcal{D}_\lambda m := \int_X \mathrm{F}_\mu(P(x))\mathcal{D}_\lambda(P(x)) := \int_X \mathrm{F}_\mu(P(x))\,|\mathrm{Det}_\lambda P'_{(x)}|\,\mathcal{D}_\lambda x \tag{21}$$

where $\mathrm{F}_\mu \in \mathbf{F}(X)$ *is defined by*

$$\mathrm{F}_\mu(x) := \int_X \Theta(x', x)\; d\mu(x') \tag{22}$$

with μ *the Haar measure on the dual group* X' *underlying the topological dual* $(\mathcal{FC}^m)'$*. (As in CDM for paths,* X' *is assumed locally compact.)*

Structurally, functional integrals for fields are not much different from path integrals. But there are complications lurking in $\mathcal{FM}$ *concerning* Λ*. Borrowing from the path integral case, one approach is to specify* Λ *by means of finite projections. In the context of QFT, the convention is to construct a projective system based on causal ordering in* $\mathbb{R}^{3,1}$ *and account for the spatial dependence through the formal device* $\lim_{m\to\infty} \mathbb{C}^m$*. That is, one considers a field on space-time to be a path with an infinite number of components indexed by some space-like surface (including any other discrete quantum numbers carried by the field).*

More generally, in the context of FQFT one decomposes[11] $\mathbb{D} = \Sigma \times \mathbb{T}$ *and constructs the projective system* $\Sigma \times \{\mathrm{t}\}$ *with* $\mathrm{t} \in \mathbb{T}$*. The sewing axiom is a consequence of the composition of projections, but unitarity and locality are extra conditions imposed by the physics. As in the case of paths, Fourier duality and dual projective systems allow for the definition of projective Sobolev distributions. And the CDM scheme allows one to effectively transfer* Λ *from* $\mathcal{FM}$ *to the space of integrable functionals on the dual space* X'*.*

The projective approach for fields is a direct generalization of the original $d = 0 + 1$ *path version, and it gains legitimacy through comparison with canonical quantization and operator methods. In favorable circumstances, one is able to find a fairly simple description of* Λ *leading to exactly solvable models. Examples include partition functions and local* n*-point functions in rational CFT and TQFT.*

Conversely, specifying Λ *in the context of perturbative QFT is far more involved. For one thing, singular* n*-point functions require regularization. In addition, one typically requires invariance of various objects under some kind of infinite dimensional symmetry, and this redundancy must be consistently accounted for at each level of perturbation. Resolution of these two issues requires the programs of renormalization and gauge theory.*

It is important to implement these programs within this framework, but the study is expected to be lengthy and so better presented elsewhere. We do want to make some brief remarks, however. First of all, one cannot interpret renormalization as a rescaling of fields in this framework because scalar multiplication in X *is not supported. On the other hand, it is tempting to speculate that physical considerations might lead to some topology on the dual space* X' *that would effectively act as a cut-off for continuous fields and hence regulate the theory. Next, the renormalization group program appears to fit into the framework via* Λ*. Finally, the idea of effective field theories seems to be captured by the notion of topologically induced localization.*

[11] Of course there is nothing forcing the decomposition $\mathbb{D} = \Sigma \times \mathbb{T}$, and there are on-going attempts at making sense of the general case in the guise of "extended" FQFT. However, now one looses grounding in canonical quantization so physics can no longer supply direct guidance or motivation.

4 Quadratic-type integrators

This section develops integrators based on sesquilinear forms on abelian topological groups. Such forms give rise to the ubiquitous Gaussian integrator family as well as the symplectic integrator family to be introduced below. We restrict to 'path integrals' because this simpler context allows attention to be focused on the properties of the integrators without the distractions and issues fields bring to the story. Nevertheless, extending these quadratic-type integrator families to include fields is straightforward; regularization and local symmetry notwithstanding.

Consider the space $\mathcal{P}_a\mathbb{C}^m \equiv Z_a$ of pointed paths $z : (\mathbb{T}, \mathrm{t}_a) \to (\mathbb{C}^m, \mathrm{z}_a)$. The involution and complex structure on $\mathbb{C}^m$ induce an involution and complex structure on Z_a according to the prescriptions $z^*(\mathrm{t}) = z(\mathrm{t})^*$ and $\mathrm{J}z(\mathrm{t}) = iz(\mathrm{t})$ and $\mathrm{J}z^*(\mathrm{t}) = -iz(\mathrm{t})^*$. By duality, these structures can be transferred to Z'_a. For example $\mathrm{J}'z'(\mathrm{t}) = iz'(\mathrm{t})$ where the dual J' is determined by $\langle \mathrm{J}'z', z\rangle = \langle z', \mathrm{J}z\rangle$. Remind that J induces a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ grading on Z_a through the projection $\mathrm{P}^\pm := 1/2(\mathrm{Id} \pm i\mathrm{J})$; Likewise for J'.

Let Z'_a be endowed with a continuous, sesquilinear form $\mathrm{F}' : {Z'}_a \times Z'_a \to \mathbb{C}$ defined by

$$\mathrm{F}'({z'}_1, z'_2) := \langle {z'}_1, Gz'_2\rangle \tag{23}$$

where the (linear) covariance $G : Z'_a \to Z_a$ is nondegenerate with domain $\overline{\mathrm{D}_G} = Z'_a$. On the dual space Z_a, construct a sesquilinear form $\mathrm{F} : Z_a \times Z_a \to \mathbb{C}$ given by

$$\mathrm{F}(z_1, z_2) - \mathrm{B}(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2) = -\langle Dz_1, z_2\rangle =: \mathrm{F}_\mathrm{B}(z_1, z_2) \tag{24}$$

where $\mathrm{B}(\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)$ is a sesquilinear boundary form depending on *mean* paths $\bar{z}$ determined by $D\bar{z} = 0$ and endowed with suitable boundary conditions. Because the argument of a form or map already indicates its domain, we will not distinguish between say F' and F or D and D' in the sequel unless to avoid confusion.

Let $Z_{\bar{z}_a} := Z_a \backslash \mathrm{Ker}(D)$. Then, *restricting to this factor space*, we require $DG = \mathrm{Id}_{Z'_{\bar{z}_a}}$ and $GD = \mathrm{Id}_{Z_{\bar{z}_a}}$, and so in this sense F' and F are inverse modulo a boundary form on $Z_{\bar{z}_a}$. Further, any $z \in Z_a$ can be reached from a given $\bar{z}$ by $z = \bar{z} + Gz'$ for all $z' \in Z'_{\bar{z}_a}$. Consequently, each mean path spawns a copy of $Z_{\bar{z}_a}$ in Z_a.

Decompose F_B into Hermitian and skew-Hermitian parts according to $\mathrm{F}_\mathrm{B} = \mathrm{Q}_\mathrm{B} + \Omega_\mathrm{B}$ where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Q}_\mathrm{B}(z_1, z_2) &= -\frac{1}{2}\left\{\langle Dz_1^*, z_2\rangle + \langle Dz_2^*, z_1\rangle\right\} = -\frac{1}{2}\left\langle (D + D^\dagger)z_1^*, z_2\right\rangle \\
\Omega_\mathrm{B}(z_1, z_2) &= -\frac{1}{2}\left\{\langle Dz_1^*, z_2\rangle - \langle Dz_2^*, z_1\rangle\right\} = -\frac{1}{2}\left\langle (D - D^\dagger)z_1^*, z_2\right\rangle \ .
\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

Note that $\mathrm{Q}_\mathrm{B}(z_1, z_2) = \mathrm{Q}_\mathrm{B}(z_2, z_1)^*$ but $\Omega_\mathrm{B}(z_1, z_2) = -\Omega_\mathrm{B}(z_2, z_1)^*$. To make contact with quantum mechanics, use $\mathrm{Q}_\mathrm{B}(z_1, z_2)$ (resp. $i\Omega_\mathrm{B}(z_1, z_2)$) to define a norm on $Z_{\bar{z}_a}$ then complete $Z_{\bar{z}_a}$ with respect to this norm to get the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{Q}_\mathrm{B}}$ (resp. $\mathcal{H}_{\Omega_\mathrm{B}}$) of paths possessing boundary conditions encoded in B. Remind that this structure induces a canonical isomorphism between Z_a and Z'_a. Clearly the Hilbert space based on Q_B is very different from that based on Ω_B.

4.1 Gaussian integrators

Gaussian integrators are constructed from Hermitian $\mathrm{Q_B}$. Let Z_a be the underlying abelian group of the space of pointed paths. Equip its dual group Z_a' with a suitable topology and denote the group duality by $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle : Z_a' \times Z_a \to \mathbb{C}$.

Definition 4.1 *A family of Gaussian integrators $\mathcal{D}_\Lambda \omega_{\bar z,\mathrm{Q_B}}(z)$ is characterized by*[12]

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta_{\bar z,\mathrm{Q_B}}(z,z') &= e^{2\pi i\langle z',(z-\bar z)\rangle-(\pi/\mathrm{s})[\mathrm{Q}(z-\bar z)-\mathrm{B}(\bar z)]}\\ Z_{\bar z,\mathrm{W_B}}(z') &= \mathrm{Det}(\mathrm{sW_B})^{1/2} e^{-\pi \mathrm{s} \mathrm{W_B}(z')}\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

where $\mathrm{W_B}$ is inverse to $\mathrm{Q_B}$, the parameter $\mathrm{s} \in \mathbb{C}_+ := \mathbb{R}_+ \times i\mathbb{R}$, and the functional determinant is assumed to be well-defined.

The Gaussian integrator family is defined in terms of the primitive integrator family $\mathcal{D}_\Lambda z$ by

$$\mathcal{D}_\lambda \omega_{\bar z,\mathrm{Q_B}}(z) := e^{-(\pi/\mathrm{s})[\mathrm{Q}(z-\bar z)-\mathrm{B}(\bar z)]} \mathcal{D}_\lambda z \tag{27}$$

where $\mathcal{D}_\Lambda z$ is characterized by

$$\Theta_{0,\mathrm{Id}}(z,z') = e^{2\pi i\langle z',z\rangle-(\pi/\mathrm{s})\mathrm{Id}(z)} \;\;;\;\; Z_{0,\mathrm{Id}}(z') = \sqrt{\mathrm{s}}\, e^{-\pi \mathrm{s}\, \mathrm{Id}(z')} \tag{28}$$

where $\mathrm{Id}(z) = \langle Id\, z^*, z\rangle = |z|^2$.

Remark that there will be obvious restrictions on $\Re(\mathrm{s}^{-1}\mathrm{Q}) = \Re(\mathrm{s}^{-1}(q\circ\lambda))$ corresponding to integrable $q(z_\lambda)$.

Loosely, the primitive integrator $\mathcal{D}z$ (which is characterized by zero mean and trivial covariance) is the infinite dimensional analog of the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{C}^n$. Note that $\mathrm{W_B}$ (and hence $\mathrm{Det}\,\mathrm{W_B}$), inherits the boundary conditions imposed on z, and note the normalizations (using $\mathrm{Det}(\mathrm{Id}) := 1$)

$$\int_{Z_0} \mathcal{D}_\lambda \omega_{0,\mathrm{Id}}(z) = \int_{Z_0} e^{-(\pi/\mathrm{s})\mathrm{Id}(z)} \mathcal{D}_\lambda z = \sqrt{\mathrm{s}} \tag{29}$$

and

$$\int_{Z_a} \mathcal{D}_\lambda \omega_{\bar z,\mathrm{Q_B}}(z) = \sum\!\!\!\!\!\!\int_{\bar z} \int_{Z_{\bar z a}} \mathcal{D}_\lambda \omega_{\bar z,\mathrm{Q_B}}(z) = \sum\!\!\!\!\!\!\int_{\bar z} \mathrm{Det}(\mathrm{sW_B})^{1/2} e^{(\pi/\mathrm{s})\mathrm{B}(\bar z)}\ . \tag{30}$$

Three points to emphasize: The fiducial Gaussian integrator $\mathcal{D}_\lambda \omega_{0,\mathrm{Id}}(z)$ is associated with the bona fide Banach space $Z_0 = Z_{\bar z_0}$ where the primitive integrator is translation invariant, i.e. $\mathcal{D}_\lambda(z_1 - z_2) = \mathcal{D}_\lambda(z_1)$. For any given $\bar z$, the middle integral in (30) can therefore be written as an integral over Z_0 by a change of integration variable $z - \bar z \mapsto \widetilde z$ with $\widetilde z(\mathrm{t}_a) = 0$ since the primitive integrator is translation invariant. Finally, since there is a copy of $Z_{\bar z_a}$ for each non-trivial zero mode, we see clearly why an integral over the full space Z_a must include a sum/integral over all $\bar z$.

[12] This definition uses a different normalization from the usual Gaussian integrator in the CDM scheme. Both definitions are valid: we choose this normalization because it seems more consistent with definitions of other integrator families and it highlights the role of the functional determinant.

Remark 4.1 The definition of functional integral allows to take limits of Gaussian integral operators with respect to the parameter s when the limits exist for the finite-dimensional integrals. Accordingly, one can define an integrator analog of the Dirac measure;

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{|\mathrm{s}|\to 0}\frac{1}{Z_{\bar z,\mathrm{W_B}}(0)}\int_{Z_{\bar z a}}\Theta_{\bar z,\mathrm{Q_B}}(z,z')\mathcal{D}_\lambda z &=: \int_{Z_{\bar z_a}} e^{2\pi i\langle z',(z-\bar z)\rangle}\delta(z-\bar z)\mathcal{D}_\lambda z\\ &=: \int_{Z_{\bar z_a}} e^{2\pi i\langle z',z\rangle}\mathcal{D}_\lambda\delta(z)\\ &= \lim_{|\mathrm{s}|\to 0} e^{-\pi \mathrm{s}\mathrm{W_B}(x')} = 1\ . \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

The definition makes sense because i) $\Theta_{\bar z,\mathrm{Q_B}}(z,0)/Z_{\bar z,\mathrm{W_B}}(0) = \Theta_{\bar z,\mathrm{Q_B}}(z,0)/Z_{\bar z,\mathrm{Q_B^{-1}}}(0)$ localizes to a Gaussian distribution which tends to a delta function as $|\mathrm{s}|\to 0$; and ii) it obviously is consistent with the finite-dimensional definition.

On the other hand, for $|\mathrm{s}|\to\infty$,

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{|\mathrm{s}|\to\infty}\int_{Z_{\bar z a}}\Theta_{\bar z,\mathrm{Q_B}}(z,z')\mathcal{D}_\lambda z &=: \int_{Z_{\bar z_a}} e^{2\pi i\langle z',(z-\bar z)\rangle}\mathcal{D}_\lambda z\\ &= \lim_{|\mathrm{s}|\to\infty}\mathrm{Det}(\mathrm{sW_B})^{1/2}e^{-\pi\mathrm{sW_B}(z')}\\ &= \lim_{|\mathrm{s}|\to 0}\mathrm{Det}(\mathrm{sQ_B})^{-1/2}e^{-(\pi/\mathrm{s})\mathrm{Q_B^{-1}}(z')} =: \delta(z')\ . \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

Again, the definition makes sense for the same reasons. But notice the mismatch in normalization.

4.2 Symplectic integrators

Symplectic integrators are constructed from skew-Hermitian Ω_B. To emphasize the skew-Hermitian nature of Ω_B, we will change notation $z\to\eta$ in this context but stress that η is *not* Grassmann. The notation η is only meant to remind of the underlying skew symmetry.

Definition 4.2 *A family of symplectic integrators $\mathcal{D}\omega_{\bar\eta,\Omega_\mathrm{B}}(\eta)$ is characterized by*

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta_{\bar\eta,\Omega_\mathrm{B}}(\eta,\eta') &= e^{2\pi i\langle\eta',(\eta-\bar\eta)\rangle_- (\pi/\mathrm{s})[\Omega(\eta-\bar\eta)-\mathrm{B}(\bar\eta)]}\\ Z_{\bar\eta,\mathrm{M_B}}(\eta') &= \mathrm{Pf}(\mathrm{sM_B})^{-1}e^{-\pi\mathrm{sM_B}(\eta')}\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

where $\mathrm{M_B}$ is inverse to Ω_B, the parameter $\mathrm{s}\in\mathbb{C}_+ := \mathbb{R}_+\times i\mathbb{R}$, and the functional Pfaffian is defined by $\mathrm{Pf(M)} := \mathrm{Det(M)}^{1/2}$.

The integrator family is defined in terms of the primitive symplectic integrator $\mathcal{D}\eta$;

$$\mathcal{D}\omega_{\bar\eta,\Omega_\mathrm{B}}(\eta) := e^{-(\pi/\mathrm{s})[\Omega(\eta-\bar\eta)-\mathrm{B}(\bar\eta)]}\mathcal{D}\eta \tag{34}$$

where $\mathcal{D}\eta$ is characterized by

$$\Theta(\eta',\eta) = e^{2\pi i\langle\eta',\eta\rangle-(\pi/\mathrm{s})\mathrm{Id}(\eta)}\ \ ;\ \ Z(\eta') = \frac{1}{\sqrt{s}}\,e^{-\pi\mathrm{s}\ \mathrm{Id}(\eta')}\ . \tag{35}$$

Here $\mathrm{Id}(\eta) = i\langle J\eta^*,\eta\rangle = |\eta|^2$.

Parallel to the Gaussian case, the extreme values of s lead to

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{|\mathrm{s}|\to 0}\frac{1}{Z_{\bar\eta,\mathrm{M_B}}(0)}\int_{Z_{\bar\eta_a}}\Theta_{\bar\eta,\Omega_\mathrm{B}}(\eta,\eta')\mathcal{D}_\lambda\eta &= \int_{Z_{\bar\eta_a}} e^{2\pi i\langle\eta',(\eta-\bar\eta)\rangle}\delta(\eta-\bar\eta)\mathcal{D}_\lambda\eta \\ &= \lim_{|\mathrm{s}|\to 0} e^{-\pi\mathrm{s}\mathrm{M_B}(\eta')} = 1\ , \end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{|\mathrm{s}|\to\infty}\int_{Z_{\bar\eta_a}}\Theta_{\bar\eta,\Omega_\mathrm{B}}(\eta,\eta')\mathcal{D}_\lambda\eta &= \int_{Z_{\bar\eta_a}} e^{2\pi i\langle\eta',(\eta-\bar\eta)\rangle}\mathcal{D}_\lambda\eta \\ &= \lim_{|\mathrm{s}|\to\infty}\mathrm{Pf}(\mathrm{sM_B})^{-1}e^{-\pi\mathrm{s}\mathrm{M_B}(\eta')} =: \delta(\eta')\ . \end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

Evidently, symplectic integrators provide access to Pfaffian-type partition functions without invoking Berezin integration.

Example 4.1 Mathai-Quillen Thom class representative:

Suppose $D \equiv i\mathrm{D}J\mathrm{D}$ *were* $\mathrm{D}: Z_a \to Z_a$ *is a first-order linear differential operator such that* $\mathrm{D} = \mathrm{D}^\dagger$. *Its dual (transpose), which we also denote by* D *(instead of* D'*), is determined by* $\langle \mathrm{D}\eta',\eta\rangle := \langle\eta',\mathrm{D}\eta\rangle$, *and* $J: Z_a \to Z_a'$ *is canonically associated with the complex structure* J *so that* $JJ = -\mathrm{Id}_{Z_a}$ *and* $J^\dagger = -J$.

Then $G = i\mathrm{G}J\mathrm{G}$ *and*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{M_B}(\eta_1',\eta_2') &= \frac{-i}{2}\left\{\langle\eta'^*_1,\mathrm{G}J\mathrm{G}\eta_2'\rangle - \langle\eta'^*_2,\mathrm{G}J\mathrm{G}\eta_1'\rangle\right\} \\ &= -i\langle\mathrm{G}\eta'^*_1, J\mathrm{G}\eta_2'\rangle \\ &= \langle\psi_1^*, -iJ\psi_2\rangle =: (\psi_1|\psi_2)_{Z_a'} \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

where we have defined $\psi := \mathrm{G}\eta'$ *and* $(\psi_1|\psi_2)_{Z_a'}$ *is a scalar product on* Z_a'.

Choose boundary conditions on $\bar\eta$ *so that* $\mathrm{B}(\bar\eta) = 0$. *The corresponding symplectic functional integral characterization encodes a useful Fourier duality between* η *and* ψ*:*

$$\int_{Z_a} e^{2\pi i\langle J\,\mathrm{G}^{-1}\psi,\eta\rangle - (\pi/\mathrm{s})\Omega_\mathrm{B}(\eta)}\,\mathcal{D}\eta = \sum\!\!\!\!\!\!\int_{\bar\eta}\mathrm{Pf}(\mathrm{s}M_\mathrm{B})^{-1}e^{-\pi\mathrm{s}(\psi|\psi)_{Z_a'}}\ . \tag{39}$$

The topological and supersymmetric aspects of this object are well studied and understood. It is noteworthy that symplectic integrators are germane in this context.

For a specific, familiar application, let $\mathbb{M}$ *be a smooth real Riemannian manifold with based loop space* $\Omega\mathbb{M} = \bigsqcup_{\mathrm{m}_a}\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{m}_a}\mathbb{M}$ *such that* $x(\mathrm{t}_a) = \mathrm{m}_a$ *and* $\dot x(\mathrm{t}_b) = 0$. *Parametrize* $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{m}_a}\mathbb{M}$ *by the Banach space* $T_x(\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{m}_a}\mathbb{M}) \equiv Z_0$ *via the exponential map* $\mathrm{Exp}: Z_0 \to \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{m}_a}\mathbb{M}$. *Notice that, since* $Z_0 \ni \eta: \mathbb{T} \to T(\mathbb{M})$, *the domain of functional integration is the Banach space of smooth sections of the tangent bundle* $T(\mathbb{M})$ *with* $\eta_x(\mathrm{t}_a) = 0$ *and* $\dot\eta_x(\mathrm{t}_b) = 0$ *where* $\eta_x(\mathrm{t}) \in T_{x(\mathrm{t})}(\mathbb{M})$.

Let the linear first-order operator $\mathrm{D} = \nabla_\mathrm{t}$ *where* ∇_t *is the Levi-Civita connection on* $\mathbb{M}$ *pulled back to* $\mathbb{T}$ *via the loop* x. *Then* $\bar x_a(\mathrm{t}) = \mathrm{m}_a$ *for all* $\mathrm{t} \in \mathbb{T}$ *and* $Z_a = \bigsqcup_{\bar\eta_a} Z_{\bar\eta_a}$. *Finally, take* $\mathrm{s} = 1$, *restrict to* $Z_{\bar\eta_a}$, *and thereby obtain the Thom class representative à la Mathai-Quillen*

$$\int_{Z_{\bar\eta_a}} e^{\,\pi(\psi|\psi)_{Z_a'} + 2\pi i\langle J\,\mathrm{D}\psi,\eta\rangle - \pi\Omega_{\mathrm{m}_a}(\eta)}\,\mathcal{D}\eta = \mathrm{Pf}(\Omega_{\mathrm{m}_a}) \tag{40}$$

where $\psi : \mathbb{T} \to T^*(\mathbb{M})$. In particular, for the zero section $\psi = 0$,

$$\int_{Z_a} e^{-\pi\Omega_{\mathrm{m}_a}(\eta)}\, \mathcal{D}\eta = \int_{\mathbb{M}} \mathrm{Pf}(\Omega_{\mathrm{m}_a})\ . \tag{41}$$

More generally, for nontrivial ψ reinstate the parameter s *and take the limit $|\mathrm{s}| \to \infty$. In this case, both sides localize onto the zero-locus of ψ.*

5 Non-quadratic integrators

5.1 Gamma family

Definition 5.1 *Let T_0 be the space of continuous pointed maps $\tau : (\mathbb{T}_+, \mathrm{t}_a) \to (\mathbb{C}_+, 1)$ where $\mathbb{T}_+ \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\mathbb{C}_+ := \mathbb{R}_+ \times i\mathbb{R}$ is the right-half complex plane. T_0 is an abelian topological group under point-wise multiplication in the first component and point-wise addition in the second component. Let β' be a fixed element in the dual group T_0' of linear characters $\mathrm{Hom}_C(T_0, \mathbb{C})$. A gamma family of integrators $\mathcal{D}_\Lambda \gamma_{\alpha,\beta'}(\tau)$ on T_0 is characterized by*

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_{\alpha,\beta'}(\tau,\tau') &= e^{i\langle\tau',\tau\rangle - \langle\beta',\tau\rangle}\, \tau^\alpha \\ Z_{\alpha,\beta',\lambda}(\tau') &= \mathrm{Det}_\lambda(\beta' - i\tau')^{-\alpha} \end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

where $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$, τ^α is defined point-wise by $\tau^\alpha(\mathrm{t}) := e^{\alpha \log \tau(\mathrm{t})}$ with the principal value prescription for $\log \tau(\mathrm{t})$, and the functional determinant $\mathrm{Det}_\lambda(\beta' - i\tau')$ is assumed to be well-defined (through specification of λ).

The gamma integrator family is defined in terms of the primitive integrator $\mathcal{D}_\lambda \tau$ by

$$\mathcal{D}_\lambda \gamma_{\alpha,\beta'}(\tau) := e^{-\langle\beta',\tau\rangle} \tau^\alpha\, \mathcal{D}_\lambda \tau \tag{43}$$

where $\mathcal{D}_\lambda \tau$ is characterized by

$$\Theta_{0,Id'}(\tau,\tau') = \exp\{i\langle\tau',\tau\rangle - \langle Id',\tau\rangle\} \ \ ; \ \ Z_{0,Id',\lambda}(\tau') = \Gamma_\lambda(0)\ , \tag{44}$$

and implicit in $\Gamma_\lambda(0)$ is a regularization.

In applications, one often imposes a bound on $\tau(\mathrm{t})$, i.e. $|\tau(\mathrm{t})| \leq |c|$ for all $\mathrm{t} \in [\mathrm{t}_a, \mathrm{t}_b]$ and for some finite constant $c \in \mathbb{C}_+$. The obvious tool to enforce this constraint is the functional analog of Heaviside; yielding a 'cut-off' gamma family that generalizes the previous definition but reduces to it as the cutoff $|c| \to \infty$.

Definition 5.2 *Let T_0 be the space of continuous pointed maps $\tau : (\mathbb{T}_+, \mathrm{t}_a) \to (\mathbb{C}_+, 1)$. Let β' be a fixed element in the dual group T_0' and fix a fiducial $\tau_o \in T_0$ such that $\langle\beta', \tau_o\rangle = c \in \mathbb{C}_+$. A lower gamma family of integrators $\mathcal{D}_\Lambda \gamma_{\alpha,\beta',c}(\tau)$ on T_0 is characterized by*

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_{\alpha,\beta'}(\tau,\tau') &= e^{i\langle\tau',\tau\rangle - \langle\beta',\tau\rangle}\, \tau^\alpha \\ Z_{\alpha,\beta',c,\lambda}(\tau') &= \frac{\gamma_\lambda(\alpha, c)}{\mathrm{Det}_\lambda(\beta' - i\tau')^\alpha} \end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

where $\gamma_\lambda(\alpha, c)$ *is the lower incomplete gamma functional given by*

$$\gamma_\lambda(\alpha, c) = \Gamma_\lambda(\alpha) e^{-c} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(c)^{\alpha+n}}{\Gamma(\alpha + n + 1)} , \tag{46}$$

and the functional determinant $\mathrm{Det}_\lambda(\beta' - i\tau')$ *is assumed to be well-defined.*

An upper gamma family of integrators $\mathcal{D}_\Lambda \Gamma_{\alpha,\beta',c}(\tau)$ *is defined similarly where*

$$\Gamma_\lambda(\alpha, c) = \Gamma_\lambda(\alpha) - \gamma_\lambda(\alpha, c) \tag{47}$$

is the upper incomplete gamma functional.

Using this notion, the fiducial gamma integrator $\mathcal{D}_\lambda \tau$ is $\mathcal{D}_\lambda \gamma_{0,Id',\infty}(\tau)$. It is normalized up to a factor of $\Gamma(0)$;

$$\frac{1}{\Gamma(0)} \int_{T_0} \mathcal{D}_\lambda \gamma_{0,Id',\infty}(\tau) = 1 = \frac{1}{\Gamma(0)} \int_{T_0} \mathcal{D}_\lambda \Gamma_{0,Id',0}(\tau) , \tag{48}$$

but the other family members yield

$$\frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_{T_0} \mathcal{D}_\lambda \gamma_{\alpha,\beta',\infty}(\tau) = \mathrm{Det}_\lambda \beta'^{-\alpha} = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_{T_0} \mathcal{D}_\lambda \Gamma_{\alpha,\beta',0}(\tau) . \tag{49}$$

5.1.1 Distributionals

An important aspect of the proposed scheme is localization in function spaces. The aim of this subsection is to develop some tools to effect localization on the dual group T_0'.

As motivation, consider the lower gamma integrator family, and restrict to τ 'imaginary', i.e. $\tau : (\mathbb{T}_+, \mathrm{t}_a) \to (i\mathbb{R}, 0)$. Put $\alpha = 1$, and let $L_n : T_0 \to i\mathbb{R}^n$ so that $\langle \beta', L_n(\tau) \rangle \mapsto 2\pi \boldsymbol{\omega} \cdot i\mathbf{u}$ with $\mathbf{u}, \boldsymbol{\omega} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\boldsymbol{\omega} = \boldsymbol{\omega}^*$. Then,

$$\int_{T_0} \mathcal{D}_\lambda \gamma_{1,\beta'}(\tau) \xrightarrow{L_n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-2\pi i \boldsymbol{\omega} \cdot \mathbf{u}} d\mathbf{u} = \delta(\boldsymbol{\omega}) . \tag{50}$$

with the integral over $\mathbb{R}^n$ understood as an inverse Fourier transform. On the other hand,

$$\int_{T_0} \mathcal{D}_\lambda \gamma_{1,\beta',\tau_o}(\tau) := \frac{\gamma_\lambda(1, \tau_o)}{\mathrm{Det}_\lambda(\beta')} = \frac{1 - e^{-\tau_o}}{\mathrm{Det}_\lambda(\beta')} , \tag{51}$$

and so the integrator $\mathcal{D}_\lambda \gamma_{1,\beta',\infty}(\tau)$ can be understood as a limit;

$$\int_{T_0} \mathcal{D}_\lambda \gamma_{1,\beta',\infty}(\tau) := \lim_{|\tau_o| \to \infty} \int_{T_0} \mathcal{D}_\lambda \gamma_{1,\beta',\tau_o}(\tau) . \tag{52}$$

Consequently, when τ_o is strictly imaginary, $\mathcal{D}_\lambda \gamma_{1,\beta',\infty}(\tau)$ can be interpreted as the functional analog of a two-sided Laplace transform implying

$$\int_{T_0} \mathcal{D}_\lambda \gamma_{1,\beta',\infty}(\tau) = \lim_{|\tau_o| \to \infty} \frac{e^{\tau_o} - e^{-\tau_o}}{\mathrm{Det}_\lambda(\beta')} ; \tag{53}$$

which formally vanishes except when $\mathrm{Det}_\lambda(\beta') = 0$. This can be interpreted as the functional analog of a delta function. In particular, this integrator can be used to localize onto the kernel of β'.

Conversely, if τ is 'real', i.e. $\tau : (\mathbb{T}_+, \mathrm{t}_a) \to (\mathbb{R}_+, 1)$, then

$$\int_{T_0} \mathcal{D}_\lambda \gamma_{1,\beta',\infty}(\tau) := \lim_{\tau_o \to \infty} \frac{\gamma_\lambda(1, \tau_o)}{\mathrm{Det}_\lambda(\beta')} = \lim_{\tau_o \to \infty} \frac{1 - e^{-\tau_o}}{\mathrm{Det}_\lambda(\beta')} \ , \tag{54}$$

which we interpret as a principal value.

These observations suggest the definition:

Definition 5.3 *Suppose* $\langle \beta', \tau \rangle \in i\mathbb{R}$ *and* $\mathrm{Det}_\lambda(\beta')$ *is degenerate. A delta functional on* T_0' *is defined by*

$$\delta_\lambda(\beta') := \frac{1}{\Gamma(1)} \int_{T_0} \mathcal{D}_\lambda \gamma_{1,\beta'}(\tau) \ . \tag{55}$$

If instead $\langle \beta', \tau \rangle \in \mathbb{R}_+$,

$$\mathrm{Pv}_\lambda(\beta') := \frac{1}{\Gamma(1)} \int_{T_0} \mathcal{D}_\lambda \gamma_{1,\beta'}(\tau) \ . \tag{56}$$

Remark that this definition suggests the characterization

$$\delta_\lambda^{(\alpha-1)'}(\beta') = \frac{i^{\alpha-1}}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_{T_0} \mathcal{D}_\lambda \gamma_{\alpha,\beta'}(\tau) \tag{57}$$

when $\langle \beta', \tau \rangle \in i\mathbb{R}$ and $\mathrm{Det}_\lambda(\beta')$ is degenerate. The characterization is "good" in the sense that $\delta_\lambda(\beta')$ reduces to the usual Dirac delta function under linear maps $L_n : T_0 \to i\mathbb{R}^n$ for any n, and for $\alpha = m \geq 1$ with $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\delta_\lambda^{(m-1)'}(\beta')(\mathrm{t}) = i^{m-1} \frac{\Gamma(m-1)}{\Gamma(m)} \int_{T_0} \frac{\delta^m}{\delta \beta'(\mathrm{t})^m} \mathcal{D} \gamma_{0,\beta'}(\tau) \ . \tag{58}$$

It appears that gamma integrators and their associated functional integrals might be used as a basis for a theory of what might be called 'distributionals', but of course much work is required to verify.

Remark 5.1 Delta functionals defined in terms of gamma-type integrators are important for imposing constraints that lead to certain types of localization. Notice that they can be interpreted as the functional analog of "the Fourier transform of 1", and the duality allows them to be transferred to T_0. Significantly, as remarked in the previous section, the notion of delta functionals can also be formulated using Gaussian-type integrators [21]. Again, duality allows them to be transferred between dual spaces. But there is a big difference between the two: Whereas the gamma family integrator is invariant under 'rescaling' by a linear map, the Gaussian family picks up a functional determinant à la Faddeev-Popov. How is one to know which type of delta functional is appropriate in a given application?

The answer proposed in [22] is based on analogy with Bayesian inference in probability theory. In essence, the type of delta functional depends on the integrator family characterizing the function space of interest. For example, if the function space is T_0, then the gamma-type delta functional is indicated. However, if the function space is a Banach space

characterized by a Gaussian integrator family, *both* types of delta functional are required. Specifically, one uses a gamma-type to localize the covariance and a Gaussian-type to localize the mean. The latter corresponds to the Faddeev-Popov method successfully utilized in QFT.

It is known that the Faddeev-Popov method is not appropriate for all types of localization:[13] In particular, it does not work for fixed energy path integrals or paths with fixed boundary conditions. But these types of constraints localize the covariance of a Gaussian and should therefore be implemented with gamma-type delta functionals [22], [23].

5.2 Poisson family

Take the lower gamma integrator and regularize by replacing $\gamma(\alpha, c)$ with the regularized lower incomplete gamma function $P(\alpha, c) := \gamma(\alpha, c)/\Gamma(\alpha)$. Restrict the parameters such that $\alpha = n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\beta' = \omega Id'$ with $\omega \in \mathbb{C}_+$, and choose the regularization implicit in λ so that $\mathrm{Det}_\lambda(\omega Id') = \omega$.

Note that, for $N \in Pois(c)$ a Poisson random variable, we have

$$Pr(N < n) = \sum_{k<n} e^{-c} \frac{(c)^k}{k!} \ . \tag{59}$$

Hence,

$$Pr(N \geq n) = \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} e^{-c} \frac{(c)^k}{k!} = P(n, c) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(n)} \int_{T_0} \mathcal{D}_\lambda \gamma_{n, Id', c}(\tau) \tag{60}$$

which, in particular, implies

$$\frac{1}{\Gamma(0)} \int_{T_0} \mathcal{D}_\lambda \gamma_{0, Id', c}(\tau) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} e^{-c} \frac{(c)^k}{k!} \ . \tag{61}$$

On the other hand,

$$e^{-c} \frac{(c)^k}{k!} = \frac{e^{-c}}{k!} \int_0^c \cdots \int_0^c \ d\tau_1, \ldots, d\tau_k \ . \tag{62}$$

Not surprisingly, $Pois(c)$ is closely related to the restricted gamma integrator which motivates the following definition:

Definition 5.4 *Let T_0 be the space of continuous pointed maps $\tau : (\mathbb{T}_+, \mathrm{t}_a) \to (\mathbb{C}_+, 1)$ endowed with a lower gamma family of integrators. Let $\alpha = n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\langle \beta', \tau_o \rangle = c$ with $c \in \mathbb{C}_+$. The Poisson integrator family $\mathcal{D}_\Lambda \pi_{n, \beta', c}(\tau)$ is characterized by*

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_{n,\beta'}(\tau, \tau') &= e^{i\langle \tau', \tau \rangle - \langle \beta', \tau \rangle} \tau^n \\ Z_{n,\beta',c,\lambda}(\tau') &= \frac{P_\lambda(n, c)}{\mathrm{Det}_\lambda (\beta' - i\tau')^n} \ . \end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

The Poisson family is defined in terms of the primitive integrator $\mathcal{D}_\lambda \tau$ by

$$\mathcal{D}_\lambda \pi_{n,\beta'}(\tau) := e^{-\langle \beta', \tau \rangle} \tau^n \, \mathcal{D}_\lambda \tau \ . \tag{64}$$

[13] The failure of the Faddeev-Popov method in some instances is sometimes attributed to the failure of quantization and constraints to commute. Our view is that functional integrals (should) perform both operations simultaneously, and so a proper formulation must include constraints and provide tools to implement them.

Note the normalization of the fiducial Poisson integrator

$$\int_{T_0} \mathcal{D}_\lambda \pi_{0,\beta',c}(\tau) = 1 \ , \tag{65}$$

and the rest of the family

$$\int_{T_0} \mathcal{D}_\lambda \pi_{n,\beta',c}(\tau) = P_\lambda(n,c) \ . \tag{66}$$

For quantum physics applications, $\Re(\tau(\mathrm{t})) = 0$ so that $\tau : (\mathbb{T}_+, \mathrm{t}_a) \to (i\mathbb{R}, 0)$. In this restricted case T_0 becomes a Banach space over $\mathbb{R}$, and it is useful to define the 'shifted' Poisson integrator by

$$\mathcal{D}_\lambda \widehat{\pi}_{n,\beta',\tau_o}(\tau) := e^{-\langle \beta', (\tau - \tau_0)\rangle} \tau^n \, \mathcal{D}_\lambda \tau \ . \tag{67}$$

Use the shifted Poisson integrator to define a Poisson average;

Definition 5.5 *Suppose $\tau : (\mathbb{T}_+, \mathrm{t}_a) \to (i\mathbb{R}, 0)$. Then the Poisson average of β' with respect to some fiducial τ_0 is defined by*

$$\langle \beta'_\lambda \rangle_{\tau_o} := \int_{T_0} \mathcal{D}_\lambda \widehat{\pi}_{0,\beta',\tau_o}(\tau) = e^{\langle \beta', \tau_0 \rangle_\lambda} \ . \tag{68}$$

For example, if we take $\langle \beta', \tau_0 \rangle_\lambda = i \int_{\mathrm{t}_a}^{\mathrm{t}_b} \beta'_\lambda(\mathrm{t}) \, d\mathrm{t}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \beta'_\lambda \rangle_{\tau_o} &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{i^n}{n!} \int_{\mathrm{t}_a}^{\mathrm{t}_b} \beta'_\lambda(\mathrm{t}_1) \cdots \int_{\mathrm{t}_a}^{\mathrm{t}_b} \beta'_\lambda(\mathrm{t}_n) \, d\mathrm{t}_1, \ldots, d\mathrm{t}_n \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \int_{\mathrm{t}_a}^{\mathrm{t}_b} i\beta'_\lambda(\mathrm{t}_1) \int_{\mathrm{t}_1}^{\mathrm{t}_b} i\beta'_\lambda(\mathrm{t}_2) \cdots \int_{\mathrm{t}_n}^{\mathrm{t}_b} i\beta'_\lambda(\mathrm{t}_n) \, d\mathrm{t}_1, \ldots, d\mathrm{t}_n \end{aligned} \tag{69}$$

where $\mathrm{t}_a \le \mathrm{t}_1 < \cdots < \mathrm{t}_n \le \mathrm{t}_b$. Note that $\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathrm{t}_b} \langle \beta'_\lambda \rangle_{\tau_o} = i\beta'_\lambda(\mathrm{t}_b) \langle \beta'_\lambda \rangle_{\tau_o}$, so the Poisson average solves a first-order evolution equation.

5.2.1 Evolution operator

In the definition of the Poisson integrator family, we took $\beta' \in \mathrm{Hom}_C(T_0, \mathbb{C})$. But one of the virtues of the proposed definition of functional integrals allows for more general $\mathfrak{B}$. For example, take $\mathfrak{B} = L_B(\mathcal{H})$; the algebra of bounded linear operators on some Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ so that $\beta' \in \mathrm{Hom}_C(T_0, L_B(\mathcal{H}))$.

Restrict to the case $\tau : (\mathbb{T}_+, \mathrm{t}_a) \to (i\mathbb{R}, 0)$ and let Hermitian H' represent a Hamiltonian by $\langle \mathrm{H}', \tau_o \rangle_\lambda = i \int_{\mathbb{T}_+} \mathrm{H}_\lambda(\mathrm{t}) \, d\mathrm{t}$. Formally, its scaled Poisson average is

$$\langle \mathrm{H}'_\lambda \rangle_{\tau_0} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} (\langle \mathrm{H}', \tau_o \rangle_\lambda)^n \ , \tag{70}$$

but we have to make sense of the operator $(\langle \mathrm{H}', \tau_o \rangle_\lambda)^n$.

First, note that $\tau(\mathrm{t}_a)$ resides on the real axis so the image $\tau(\mathbb{T}_+)$ is a line segment in the upper or lower half quadrant of $\mathbb{C}_+$. Let $L_n : T_0 \to i\mathbb{R}_+^n$ by $\tau \mapsto \boldsymbol{\tau} := \{\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_n\}$ where[14]

[14]Here $L_i := P_i \circ L_n$ where P_i is the projection $i\mathbb{R}_+^n \to i\mathbb{R}_+^i$.

$\tau_i = L_i(\tau)$ such that $0 \leq \tau_1 < \tau_2, \ldots \leq c$. In words, L_n maps τ to the waiting times that characterize a Poisson process. Under this projection,

$$\langle \mathrm{H}', \tau_0 \rangle_\lambda \to \langle \mathrm{H}', L_n(\tau_0) \rangle_\lambda = i^n \int_{\mathbb{T}_+^n} \mathrm{H}_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\tau}_0)\, d\boldsymbol{\tau}_0 \tag{71}$$

where $\mathrm{H}_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\tau}_0)$ is symmetric under arbitrary permutations of the components of $\boldsymbol{\tau}_0$.

For most systems one usually specifies λ by stipulating $\mathrm{H}_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\tau}_0)$ is the product of the system Hamiltonian evaluated at each τ_i. But since $\mathrm{H}_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\tau}_0)$ is symmetric under permutations of $\boldsymbol{\tau}_0$, the product must be the time-ordered; that is $\mathrm{H}_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\tau}_0) = \mathcal{T}\mathrm{H}(\mathrm{t}_1), \ldots, \mathrm{H}(\mathrm{t}_n)$ so that $\int_{\mathbb{T}_+^n} \mathrm{H}_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\tau}_0)\, d\boldsymbol{\tau}_0 = (\mathcal{T}\langle \mathrm{H}', \tau_o \rangle)^n$ where $\mathcal{T}$ denotes time ordering. This yields the well-known Dyson series

$$\langle \mathrm{H}'_\lambda \rangle_{\tau_0} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} (\mathcal{T}\langle \mathrm{H}', \tau_o \rangle)^n \tag{72}$$

which can be represented as a shifted Poisson functional integral

$$\langle \mathrm{H}'_\lambda \rangle_{\tau_0} = \int_{T_0} \mathcal{D}_\lambda \widehat{\pi}_{0,\mathrm{H}',\tau_0}(\tau) \tag{73}$$

provided λ imposes time ordering.

This example is a heavy-handed way to arrive at a simple and already well-known object. However, it serves to illustrate the scope of the proposed definition, and it suggests one should look for functional integral representations of other quantum operators.

References

[1] Alvarez-Gaumé, L., Supersymmetry and the Atiyah-Singer Index Theorem, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **90**, 161–173, (1983).

[2] Witten, E., Topological Quantum Field Theory, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **17**, 353–386, (1988).

[3] Witten, E., Quantum Field Theory and the Jones Polynomial, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **121**, 351–399, (1989).

[4] Atiyah, M.F. and Jeffrey, L., Topological Lagrangians and cohomology, *J. Geom. Phys.* **7**(1), 119–136, (1990).

[5] Witten, E., Monopoles and Fouur-Manifolds, *Math. Res. Lett.* **1**, 769–796, (1994).

[6] Thompson, G., On the Generalized Casson Invariant, *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **3**, 249–280 (1999).

[7] Itô, K., Wiener integral and Feynman integral. Proc. Fourth Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability. California Univ. Press, Berkeley 2: 227–238 (1961).

[8] DeWitt-Morette, C., Feynman's Path Integral Definition Without Limiting Procedure, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **28**, 47–67, (1972).

[9] Ito, K., McKean, H.P., Diffusion Processes and their Sample Paths, Springer, Berlin (1974).

[10] Albeverio, S., Høegh-Krohn, R., Mathematical theory of Feynman path integrals, Lecture Notes in Mathematics Vol.523, Springer, Berlin (1976).

[11] Streit, L., Hida, T., Generalized Brownian Functional and the Feynman Integral, *Stoch. Proc. and their App.* **16** 55–69 (1983).

[12] Albeverio, S., Brzezniak, Z., Finite Dimensional Approximation Approach to Oscillatory Integrals and Stationary Phase in Infinite Dimensions, *J. Func. Anal.* **113**, 177–244, (1993).

[13] Hida, T., Kuo, H.-H., Pottoff, J., and Streit, L., White Noise, An Inifnite Dimensional Calculus, Kluwer Acad. Pub., Dordrecht (1993).

[14] Ichinose, W., On the Formulation of the Feynman Path Integral Through Broken Line Paths, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **189** 17–3 (1997).

[15] Johnson, G.W. and Lapidus, M.L., The Feynman and Integral and Feynman's Operational Calculus, Oxford Univ. Press, New York (2000).

[16] Kleinert, H. Path Integrals in Quantum Mechanics, Statistics, Polymer Physics, and Financial Markets, World Scientific, New Jersey (2004).

[17] Cartier, P., DeWitt-Morette, C., Functional Integration: Action and Symmetries, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2006).

[18] Albeverio, S., Mazzucchi, S., Path integral: mathematical aspects, Scholarpedia, 6(1):8832, (2011).

[19] Blau, M., Thompson, G., Localization and Diagonalization, *J. Math. Phys.* **36**, 2192 (1995).

[20] LaChapelle, J., Functional Integration for Quantum Field Theory, Integration: Mathematical Theory and Applications, **1**(4), 1–21 (2008).

[21] LaChapelle, J., Path Integral Solution of the Dirichlet Problem, *Ann. Phys.* **254**(2), 397–418 (1997).

[22] LaChapelle, J., Functional Integration on Constrained Function Spaces, arXiv:math-ph/1212.0502 (2012).

[23] LaChapelle, J., Path integral solution of linear second order partial differential equations: I and II. *Ann. Phys.* **314**, 362–424 (2004).